



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

(3)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,888	12/05/2001	Peter Eisenberger	11627/4	2892
26646	7590	08/25/2004	EXAMINER	
KENYON & KENYON ONE BROADWAY NEW YORK, NY 10004				PESIN, BORIS M
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2174		

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

(P)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/006,888	EISENBERGER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Boris Pesin	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities:

There is no period at the end of the claim. All claims must end with a period.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Bharat et al. (US 6411952).

In regards to claim 1, Bharat teaches a system for providing decision support data records to users comprising: a network; at least one access device capable of accessing the network wherein at least one user connects to the network using the at least one access device (i.e. Figure 1, Element 130); and a server arrangement that connects to the network (i.e. Figure 1, Element 120), wherein the server arrangement transmits data records to the at least one user based upon a predetermined mapping scheme (Figure 1, Element 230).

In regards to claim 2, Bharat does not specifically teach a system where the server arrangement includes a processor, a memory arrangement and software, however these elements are inherently in Bharat.

In regards to claim 3, Bharat does not specifically teach a system wherein the network includes a public and private network, however he does teach there is a network (Figure 1, Element 131 (WEB)), it is inherent in the invention that the client computer has to be connected to some kind of a private network in order to be able to get to the public network, i.e. web.

In regards to claim 4, Bharat teaches a system wherein the at least one access device includes a processor, a memory arrangement, an input arrangement and an output arrangement (i.e. "*The client 110 includes a memory (M) and a processor (P) for storing and executing software programs.*" Column 3, Line 65 and Figure 1, Elements 111 and 112).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 5, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bharat et al. (US 6411952) in view of Gustman (US 6353831).

In regards to claim 5, Bharat teaches all the limitations of claim 1. He further teaches a system wherein the server arrangement searches the network for the data records (Figure 2, Element 210), retrieves the data records based on a predetermined search criteria (Figure 2, Element 220). He does not teach a system that stores the data records on the memory arrangement. Gustman teaches. "*A caching mechanism is implemented by asset management system 232 to store retrieved data locally.*" (Column 10, Line 48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bharat with the teachings of Gustman and include a system to store the retrieved data on the memory arrangement with the motivation to provide faster access to the data.

In regards to claim 6, Bharat and Gustman teach all the limitations of claim 5. Bharat does not teach a system wherein the server arrangement assigns at least one document content identifier to each data record. Gustman teaches, "*Each catalogue element has an associated ID (e.g., an integer ID) that uniquely identifies the catalogue element.*" (Column 8, Line 64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bharat with the teachings of Gustman and include a method to have a content identifier for each record with the motivation to provide the user with a convenient method of retrieving data.

In regards to claim 7, Bharat and Gustman teach all the limitations of claim 6. Bharat does not teach wherein the server arrangement stores the data record on the memory arrangement. Gustman teaches, "*A caching mechanism is implemented by asset management system 232 to store retrieved data locally.*" (Column 10, Line 48).

Claims 8, 9, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bharat et al. (US 6411952) in view of Fries et al. (US 6353831).

In regards to claim 8, Bharat teaches all the limitations of claim 2. He does not teach a system wherein the at least one user transmits user profile data to the server arrangement. Fries teaches, "*The user profile clues include such things as the user's age, their search history, their gender, things they have deemed as favorites, things in their browsing cache and their expertise level. The user profile may be constructed by asking the user for information or by tracking the user's interests based on the searches the user enters or the types of pages the user views.*"(Column 15, Line 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bharat with the teachings of Fries and transmit the user profile with the motivation to provide better search results.

In regards to claim 9, Bharat and Fries teach all the limitations of claim 8. Bharat does not teach a system wherein the server arrangement stores the user profile data on the memory arrangement. Fries teaches, "*The web companion may also be stored on a*

remote server and invoked through a network connection to the remote server" (Column 6, Line 7). Since the web companion is doing the searching and gathering the user profile data, it is inherent that the server arrangement stores the user profile data on the memory arrangement. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bharat with the teachings of Fries and store the user profile using the server arrangement to provide better search results.

In regards to claim 19, Bharat teaches a method of providing decision support data records to users comprising the steps of: searching a network for data records (i.e. Figure 2, Element 120); retrieving relevant data records (i.e. Figure 2, Element 220); and transmitting data records to users based upon a predetermined mapping scheme (i.e. Figure 2, Element 230). He does not teach storing the data records in a database. Fries teaches, "*In step 601, a database server 972, which forms part of Topics Dictionary 239, uses URL list 960 to generate a source database 961 that represents the associations found in URL list 960.*" (Column 12, Line 21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bharat with the teachings of Fries and include a system to store records in a database with the motivation to provide for faster queries.

In regards to claim 20, Bharat does not specifically teach a system wherein the network includes a public and private network, however he does teach there is a network (Figure 1, Element 131 (WEB)), it is inherent in the invention that the client computer has to be connected to some kind of a private network in order to be able to get to the public network.

In regards to claim 21, Bharat and Fries teach all the limitations of claim 19.

Bharat further teaches a method wherein server arrangement performs the steps of searching (Figure 2, Element 210), retrieving (Figure 2, Element 210), and transmitting (Figure 2, Element 220). Bharat does not teach storing. Fries teaches storing (Figure 13, Element 552). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bharat with the teachings of Fries and include a system to store with the motivation to provide for faster queries.

In regards to claim 22, Bharat and Fries teach all the limitations of claim 21.

Bharat does not specifically teach a system where the server arrangement includes a processor, a memory arrangement and software, however these elements are inherently in Bharat.

In regards to claim 23, Bharat and Fries teach all the limitations of claim 19.

Bharat further teaches a method wherein the user uses a computing arrangement to receive the data records (Figure 1 Element 110).

In regards to claim 24, Bharat and Fries teach all the limitations of claim 23.

Bharat teaches a method wherein the computing arrangement includes a processor, a memory arrangement, an input arrangement and an output arrangement (Figure 1, Elements 110, 112, and 111).

In regards to claim 25, Bharat and Fries teach all the limitations of claim 22.

Bharat does not teach a method wherein the database resides in the memory arrangement. Fries does not specifically teach a method wherein the database resides in the memory arrangement; however this is inherent in Fries.

In regards to claim 26, Bharat and Fries teach all the limitations of claim 19. Bharat further teaches a method wherein the data records are retrieved based on a predetermined search criteria (Figure 2, Element 230).

Claims 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bharat et al. (US 6411952) in view of Fries et al. (US 6353831) in further view of Nielsen (US 5897670).

In regards to claim 10, Bharat and Fries teach all the limitations of claim 9. They do not teach a system wherein the server arrangement assigns each user to at least one user class. Nielsen teaches, “*Typically, the user would specify a category to the method before selecting the selectable elements on the GUI. This would cause the selectable elements to be organized most efficiently for a user in this particular category.*” Column 7, Line 27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bharat and Fries with the teachings of Nielsen and include a system to categorize the users with the motivation to provide more appropriate search results.

In regards to claim 11, Bharat, Fries, and Nielsen teach all the limitations of claim 10. Bharat and Fries do not teach a system wherein the server arrangement sets class parameters to each user class. Nielsen teaches, “*the invention can organize selectable elements based upon different categories of users. For example, the selectable elements on the GUI are initially organized in a manner which is most effective for a beginning user. This organization of selectable elements provides the novice user with*

selectable elements commonly used by beginners. As the user becomes more advanced, the selectable elements are organized in a manner which is most effective for an advanced user. Embodiments of the present invention automatically organize the selectable elements in a manner most efficient for a user in each category.” Column 9, Line 33).

In regards to claim 12, Bharat, Fries, and Nielsen teach all the limitations of claim 11. Bharat and Fries do not teach a system wherein the server arrangement selectively links document content identifiers to each user class based on the class parameters. Nielsen teaches, “*the invention can organize selectable elements based upon different categories of users. For example, the selectable elements on the GUI are initially organized in a manner which is most effective for a beginning user. This organization of selectable elements provides the novice user with selectable elements commonly used by beginners. As the user becomes more advanced, the selectable elements are organized in a manner which is most effective for an advanced user. Embodiments of the present invention automatically organize the selectable elements in a manner most efficient for a user in each category.” Column 9, Line 33.* The data items are linked to the categories of users.

In regards to claim 13, Bharat, Fries, and Nielsen teach all the limitations of claim 12. Bharat and Fries do not teach a system wherein the server arrangement maps each data record to the at least one user class based on the document content identifiers assigned to each respective data record. Nielsen teaches, “*the invention can organize selectable elements based upon different categories of users. For example,*

the selectable elements on the GUI are initially organized in a manner which is most effective for a beginning user. This organization of selectable elements provides the novice user with selectable elements commonly used by beginners. As the user becomes more advanced, the selectable elements are organized in a manner which is most effective for an advanced user. Embodiments of the present invention automatically organize the selectable elements in a manner most efficient for a user in each category.” Column 9, Line 33).

In regards to claim 14, Bharat, Fries, and Nielsen teach all the limitations of claim 13. Bharat and Fries do not teach a system wherein the server arrangement transmits the data records to users based on the data record mapping. Nielsen teaches, “*the invention can organize selectable elements based upon different categories of users. For example, the selectable elements on the GUI are initially organized in a manner which is most effective for a beginning user. This organization of selectable elements provides the novice user with selectable elements commonly used by beginners. As the user becomes more advanced, the selectable elements are organized in a manner which is most effective for an advanced user. Embodiments of the present invention automatically organize the selectable elements in a manner most efficient for a user in each category.” Column 9, Line 33).*

In regards to claim 15, Bharat, Fries, and Nielsen teach all the limitations of claim 13. Bharat further teaches a system wherein a domain expert reviews each data record (Figure 2, Elements 220 and 224).

Claims 16, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bharat et al. (US 6411952) in view of Fries et al. (US 6353831) in further view of Nielsen (US 5897670) in further view of Peltonen et al. (US 5890147).

In regards to claim 16, Bharat, Fries, and Nielsen teach all the limitations of claim 15. They do not teach a system wherein the domain expert selectively modifies the document content identifiers assigned to each data record. Peltonen teaches, “*Note that if the search engine 64 uses the document identifiers in a search spanning multiple volumes, the search engine 64 need only modify the document identifier as necessary to ensure uniqueness among the multiple volumes.*” (Column 6, Line 30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bharat, Fries, and Nielsen with the teachings of Peltonen and include a system to modify the content document identifiers with the motivation to substantially improve the querying of a search engine (Peltonen, Column 2, Line 24).

In regards to claim 17, Bharat, Fries, Nielsen, and Peltonen teach all the limitations of claim 16. Bharat, Fries, and Nielsen do not teach a system wherein the domain expert selectively modifies content of the data records. Peltonen teaches, “*Note that if the search engine 64 uses the document identifiers in a search spanning multiple volumes, the search engine 64 need only modify the document identifier as necessary to ensure uniqueness among the multiple volumes.*” (Column 6, Line 30). By modifying the document identifiers, Peltonen is in fact modifying the data records.

In regards to claim 18, Bharat, Fries, Nielsen, and Peltonen teach all the limitations of claim 17. Bharat, Fries, and Nielsen do not teach a system wherein the

domain expert maps each data record based upon any modification of the data record. Peltonen teaches, "*the search engine 64 and/or the file system 40 maintains a densely packed document ID to parent-document ID mapping array 80, 82 and 84.*" (Column 7, Line 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bharat, Fries, and Nielsen with the teachings of Peltonen and include a system to map the content document identifiers with the motivation to substantially improve the querying of a search engine (Peltonen, Column 2, Line 24).

Claims 27, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bharat et al. (US 6411952) in view of Fries et al. (US 6353831) in further view of Gustman (US 6353831).

In regards to claim 27, Bharat and Fries teach all the limitations of claim 22. They do not teach a method for assigning at least one document content identifier to each data record. Gustman teaches, "*Each catalogue element has an associated ID (e.g., an integer ID) that uniquely identifies the catalogue element.*" (Column 8, Line 64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bharat and Fries with the teachings of Gustman and include a method to have a content identifier for each record with the motivation to provide the user with a convenient method of retrieving data.

In regards to claim 28, Bharat, Fries and Gustaman teach all the limitations of claim 27. Bharat does not teach a system wherein the at least one user transmits user profile data to the server arrangement. Fries teaches, "*The user profile clues include*

such things as the user's age, their search history, their gender, things they have deemed as favorites, things in their browsing cache and their expertise level. The user profile may be constructed by asking the user for information or by tracking the user's interests based on the searches the user enters or the types of pages the user views."(Column 15, Line 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bharat with the teachings of Fries and transmit the user profile with the motivation to provide better search results.

In regards to claim 29, Bharat, Fries, and Gustman teach all the limitations of claim 28. Bharat does not teach a system wherein the server arrangement stores the user profile data on the memory arrangement. ^{Fries} Fries teaches, "*The web companion may also be stored on a remote server and invoked through a network connection to the remote server*" (Column 6, Line 7). Since the web companion is doing the searching and gathering the user profile data, it is inherent that the server arrangement stores the user profile data on the memory arrangement. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bharat with the teachings of Fries and store the user profile using the server arrangement to provide better search results.

Claims 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bharat et al. (US 6411952) in view of Fries et al. (US 6353831) in further view of Gustman (US 6353831) in further view of Nielsen (US 5897670).

In regards to claim 30, Bharat, Fries, and Gustman teach all the limitations of claim 29. They do not teach a method of determining class parameters for each user

class, and storing the class parameters of each user class in the memory arrangement. Nielsen teaches, "*the invention can organize selectable elements based upon different categories of users. For example, the selectable elements on the GUI are initially organized in a manner which is most effective for a beginning user. This organization of selectable elements provides the novice user with selectable elements commonly used by beginners. As the user becomes more advanced, the selectable elements are organized in a manner which is most effective for an advanced user. Embodiments of the present invention automatically organize the selectable elements in a manner most efficient for a user in each category.*" Column 9, Line 33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bharat, Fries, and Gustman with the teachings of Nielsen and include a system to determine class parameters for each user class and store the class parameters with the motivation to provide more appropriate search results.

In regards to claim 31, Bharat, Fries, Gustman, and Nielsen teach all the limitations of claim 30. They do not teach a method of assigning each user to at least one user class. Nielsen teaches, "*the invention can organize selectable elements based upon different categories of users. For example, the selectable elements on the GUI are initially organized in a manner which is most effective for a beginning user. This organization of selectable elements provides the novice user with selectable elements commonly used by beginners. As the user becomes more advanced, the selectable elements are organized in a manner which is most effective for an advanced*

user. Embodiments of the present invention automatically organize the selectable elements in a manner most efficient for a user in each category.” Column 9, Line 33).

In regards to claim 32, Bharat, Fries, Gustman, and Nielsen teach all the limitations of claim 31. They do not teach a method of selectively linking document content identifiers to each user class based on the class parameters. Nielsen teaches, “*the invention can organize selectable elements based upon different categories of users. For example, the selectable elements on the GUI are initially organized in a manner which is most effective for a beginning user. This organization of selectable elements provides the novice user with selectable elements commonly used by beginners. As the user becomes more advanced, the selectable elements are organized in a manner which is most effective for an advanced user. Embodiments of the present invention automatically organize the selectable elements in a manner most efficient for a user in each category.” Column 9, Line 33).*

In regards to claim 33, Bharat, Fries, Gustman, and Nielsen teach all the limitations of claim 32. Bharat, Fries, and Gustman do not teach a method of mapping each data record to the at least one user class based on the document content identifiers assigned to each respective data record. Nielsen teaches, “*the invention can organize selectable elements based upon different categories of users. For example, the selectable elements on the GUI are initially organized in a manner which is most effective for a beginning user. This organization of selectable elements provides the novice user with selectable elements commonly used by beginners. As the user becomes more advanced, the selectable elements are organized in a manner which is*

most effective for an advanced user. Embodiments of the present invention automatically organize the selectable elements in a manner most efficient for a user in each category." Column 9, Line 33).

In regards to claim 34, Bharat, Fries, Gustman, and Nielsen teach all the limitations of claim 33. Bharat, Fries, and Gustman do not teach a method of transmitting data records to users based on the data record mapping. Nielsen teaches, "*the invention can organize selectable elements based upon different categories of users. For example, the selectable elements on the GUI are initially organized in a manner which is most effective for a beginning user. This organization of selectable elements provides the novice user with selectable elements commonly used by beginners. As the user becomes more advanced, the selectable elements are organized in a manner which is most effective for an advanced user. Embodiments of the present invention automatically organize the selectable elements in a manner most efficient for a user in each category.*" Column 9, Line 33).

In regards to claim 35, Bharat, Fries, Gustman, and Nielsen teach all the limitations of claim 33. Bharat further teaches a method reviewing each data record (Figure 2, Elements 224 and 220).

Claims 36, 37, 38, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bharat et al. (US 6411952) in view of Fries et al. (US 6353831) in further view of Gustman (US 6353831) in further view of Nielsen (US 5897670) in further view of Peltonen et al. (US 5890147).

In regards to claim 36, Bharat, Fries, Gustman, and Nielsen teach all the limitations of claim 35. They do not teach a method of selectively modifying the document content identifiers assigned to each data record. Peltonen teaches, “*Note that if the search engine 64 uses the document identifiers in a search spanning multiple volumes, the search engine 64 need only modify the document identifier as necessary to ensure uniqueness among the multiple volumes.*” (Column 6, Line 30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bharat, Fries, Gustman, and Nielsen with the teachings of Peltonen and include a system to modify the content document identifiers with the motivation to substantially improve the querying of a search engine (Peltonen, Column 2, Line 24).

In regards to claim 37, Bharat, Fries, Gustman, Nielsen, and Peltonen teach all the limitations of claim 36. Bharat, Fries, Gustman, and Nielsen do not teach a method for selectively modifying content of the data records. Peltonen teaches, “*Note that if the search engine 64 uses the document identifiers in a search spanning multiple volumes, the search engine 64 need only modify the document identifier as necessary to ensure uniqueness among the multiple volumes.*” (Column 6, Line 30). By modifying the document identifiers, Peltonen is in fact modifying the data records.

In regards to claim 38, Bharat, Fries, Gustman, Nielsen, and Peltonen teach all the limitations of claim 37. Bharat, Fries, Gustman, and Nielsen do not teach a method of mapping each data record based upon any modification of the data record. Peltonen teaches, “*the search engine 64 and/or the file system 40 maintains a densely packed document ID to parent-document ID mapping array 80, 82 and 84.*” (Column 7, Line 45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bharat, Fries, Gustman, and Nielsen with the teachings of Peltonen and include a system to map the content document identifiers with the motivation to substantially improve the querying of a search engine (Peltonen, Column 2, Line 24).

In regards to claim 39, Bharat, Fries, Gustman, Nielsen, and Peltonen teach all the limitations of claim 38. Bharat, Fries, Gustman, and Nielsen do not teach a method wherein a domain expert performs the steps of reviewing, modifying, and mapping. Peltonen teaches, "*Note that if the search engine 64 uses the document identifiers in a search spanning multiple volumes, the search engine 64 need only modify the document identifier as necessary to ensure uniqueness among the multiple volumes.*" (Column 6, Line 30). Peltonen further teaches "*the search engine 64 and/or the file system 40 maintains a densely packed document ID to parent-document ID mapping array 80, 82 and 84.*" (Column 7, Line 45).

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (703) 305-8774. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100